

## **AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

Please enter New Sheet 3 containing FIGS. 4 and 5 previously found at page 23 of the present specification.

Please enter Replacement sheets 1 and 2 providing updated numbering.

## REMARKS

In the Office Action dated March 31, 2008, Examiner indicated that Claims 34-41 and 44-50 were pending for consideration. Examiner also objected to page 23 of the Specification as showing figures better presented in the Drawings.

Applicants respectfully submit that the listing of claims was in error and was contrary to the Preliminary Amendment submitted April 12, 2006, and Letter to Examiner submitted July 7, 2006, as discussed in the telephonic interview of April 3, 2008. Claims 51-85 are presented in this Response and duplicate the amended claims presented in the Preliminary Amendment of April 12, 2006.

Applicants respectfully submit that each of claims 51-85 is patentable over Takizawa (U.S. Pat. 5,859,515) at least because Takizawa does not teach or suggest a multiaxis machine tool comprising a workpiece holder for receiving a workpiece. Rather, Takizawa discloses a method of operating a virtual mechanical module, which simulates a mechanical device, and a positioning apparatus that allows machine mechanisms to be replaced intact by software modules. (See Takizawa, Title and Abstract; col. 6, ll. 5-7).

Takizawa discloses, in particular, a “fourth conventional embodiment” possibly relevant to the disclosed method and apparatus, having a belt conveyor 444 and objects to be controlled 448a, 448b for machining objects to be machined 443a, 443b. (See Takizawa, col. 3, l. 40 to col. 4, l. 21). However, Takizawa fails to teach or suggest that any of the objects to be controlled 448a, 448b is a multiaxis machine tool as recited by independent claims 51, 83 and 85. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Takizawa neither anticipates nor renders obvious any of the pending claims.

Applicant notes that neither the cited Takizawa patent, nor any other references considered by Examiner is listed on the PTO-892, Notice of References Cited. Correction is requested.

Examiner objected to page 23 of the Specification as showing figures better presented in the Drawings. Applicants have amended the drawings and specification accordingly in Par. 50.1 and 56.

Applicants believe that no fees are due in connection with this Amendment and Response. If any additional fees are deemed necessary, Attorneys for Applicants hereby authorize the Commissioner to deduct such fees from our Deposit Account 13-0235.

Respectfully submitted,

By /John C. Linderman/  
John C. Linderman  
Registration No. 24,420  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Customer No. 35301  
McCORMICK, PAULDING & HUBER LLP  
CityPlace II, 185 Asylum Street  
Hartford, CT 06103-3402  
Tel: (860) 549-5290  
Fax: (860) 527-0464